

**REMARKS**

In the non-final Office Action dated March 24, 2008, it is noted that claims 1 - 11 are pending; and that claims 1 – 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102.

In the present amendment, claim 3 has been cancelled without prejudice, and claims 1, 4 – 6, 9 and 11 have been amended to more clearly and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicant regards as his invention. Claims 12-14 have been newly added. No new matter has been added.

**Objection to the Specification**

The specification has been objected to for not being broken into sections with corresponding section headings.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for providing information about recommended section headings. However, Applicant respectfully declines to add the headings. Section headings are not statutorily required for filing a non-provisional patent application under 35 USC 111(a), but per 37 CFR 1.51(d) are only guidelines that are suggested for applicant's use. (See Miscellaneous Changes in Patent Practice, Response to comments 17 and 18 (Official Gazette, August 13, 1996) [Docket No: 950620162-6014-02] RIN 0651-AA75 ("Section 1.77 is permissive rather than mandatory. ... [T]he Office will not require any application to comply with the format set forth in 1.77").

Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1, 2 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Howard et al. (US Patent 6,023,259).

Applicant submits that for at least the following reasons, claims 1, 2 and 11 are not anticipated by Howard et al.

For example, amended claim 1, now containing the features of cancelled claim 3, requires:

*“control means are adapted to select a single mode out of a plurality of available modes with respect to uniformity of said display or said light emitting elements.”*

Howard et al. apparently discloses a current driver for an active matrix organic light emitting device display. However, Applicant submits that nothing can be found in Howard et al. that teaches or suggests that *“control means are adapted to select a single mode out of a plurality of available modes with respect to uniformity of said display or said light emitting elements,”* as claimed.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Howard et al. Independent claim 11 contains many similar distinguishing features as discussed in claim 1, and therefore should also be patentable. Claim 2 should also be patentable because it depends from claim 1 with additional distinguishing features. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3 – 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ueda (US Patent 7,212,193).

Applicant further submits that for at least the following reasons, claim 1 and 3 – 11 are not anticipated by Ueda.

For example, claim 1 requires:

*“control means are provided adapted to adjust a duty cycle and a magnitude of said driving signal for at least one of said light emitting elements.”*

Ueda, apparently discloses a scanning frequency in a self-emissive display is changed based on a display content to be displayed in the self-emissive display. However, Ueda does not disclose anything about adjusting the duty cycle or the magnitude of the driving signal. Therefore, Applicant submits that there is nothing in Ueda that teaches or suggests that *“control means are provided adapted to adjust a duty cycle and a magnitude of said driving signal for at least one of said light emitting elements,”* as claimed.

Furthermore, as discussed above, claim 1 requires:

*“control means are adapted to select a single mode out of a plurality of available modes with respect to uniformity of said display or said light emitting elements.”*

Ueda, column 7, lines 29 – 53; column 9, line 34 through column 10, line 13, apparently discloses a controller that supplies the display data and the type of driving frequency signal to the driving circuit for displaying the data on the display. However, Applicant submits that the different types of driving frequency signal do not correspond to any available modes with respect to the uniformity of display or light emitting elements. This is because for a selected driving frequency, each pixel in the display is scanned the same number of times per second, and the relative brightness between pixels would be the same, and thus selecting different types of driving frequency signals would not affect the uniformity of the display or the light emitting elements.

Therefore, Ueda does not teach or suggest that *“control means are adapted to select a single mode out of a plurality of available modes with respect to uniformity of said display or said light emitting elements,”* as claimed.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Ueda. Also, claim 11 contains many similar distinguishing features as discussed in claim 1, and therefore should be patentable.

Claims 4 – 10 should also be patentable because they depend from claim 1 with each claim containing further distinguishing features. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 3 – 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

In the event there are any errors with respect to the fees for this response or any other papers related to this response, the Director is hereby given permission to charge any shortages

and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian S. Myers/

By: Brian S. Myers  
Registration No.: 46,947  
For: Larry Liberchuk  
Registration No.: 40,352

**Please Address All Correspondence to:**

Larry Liberchuk, Reg. No. 40,352  
US PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001